Giving Cell Biology an Institutional Identity

strategies to increase participation by more functionally oriented investigators (for example, they invited such investigators to serve as editors, officers, or symposium speakers).

As it turned out, however, it was not possible to structure the journal or the society precisely as the organizers had envisioned. Including Schmitt, Bear, Davis, etc., on the board of editors and having them encourage submission of papers in biophysics failed to attract significant numbers of biophysically oriented papers to the Journal of Biophysical and Biochemical Cytology. Likewise, including Green, Novikoff, Siekevitz, etc., as officers and program chairs of the ASCB failed to attract significant numbers of biochemists to join or attend meetings regularly. The existence of other institutions for biochemistry and biophysics constrained the efforts of cell biologists to position themselves in the ways they sought. Yet, in another respect, those shaping the new institutions were successful. They did avoid the narrowness of becoming a journal or society solely concerned with morphological structure, and they did succeed in establishing a new scientific domain in which the structure and function of cell constituents were well-integrated. The point I want to emphasize is that this did not just happen; it was the product of conscious attention and strategic efforts by those scientists who participated in creating these institutions.